committee could come to such a recommendation with the facts now in. Would you find it difficult to accept the proposition, at least in the cases of those laboratories which are of the highest quality and considering we could come to a way to make some evaluation, that those directors ought to have such authority?

Dr. PICKERING. I believe they should.

Mr. DADDARIO. Dr. Pickering, I wish to thank you for your testimony, and we appreciate your coming here to appear before us. We are especially fortunate because your laboratory has had the flexibility to meet new challenges over the course of time and is a case study for us. It shows that flexibility is not an impossibility. You, as well as other laboratory directors, point again to the constant need of the society to bring together the physical and social problems and to use the men who are scientifically and technically trained to accomplish these objectives. Your testimony is extremely heartening to us.

Dr. PICKERING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO DR. WILLIAM H. PICKERING BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, RESEARCH, & DEVELOPMENT

1. One of the factors you mention necessary to any successful redirection of a mission-oriented laboratory is "a decision mechanism which can assess the national priorities of new versus old missions, and which has authority to make the decisions for redirection."

(a) Who do you see in the Executive Branch as having this authority other than the President?

To the best of my knowledge, only the President possesses the authority to transfer a laboratory from one agency to another. Of course, mutual agreement by agency heads can effect such a transfer, as apparently occurred in 1953 when the National Bureau of Standards transferred laboratories to the Army and Navy; however, such agreements do not appear to be common. Also, of course, the assignments of individual laboratories are frequently changed, although within the overall mission of the agency.

(b) Do you have any suggestions as to how the present structure of government could be improved to provide this mechanism?

The Office of Science and Technology, together with the President as decision-maker, would seem to provide the framework for this mechanism. Apparently, OST has not been active in reviewing laboratory missions, and perhaps they could be encouraged to become more active in this area.

Another alternative is a Federal Department of Science and Technology. In my opinion, such a Department may, at some future time, become desirable.

2. Since JPL does not have discretionary funds, how does it explore new ideas or areas in which it may have a competence?

Discretionary funds are needed for the exploration of new areas, as well as for realization of the fullest potential within the primary mission of the laboratory. The absence of discretionary funds at JPL makes the exploration of new ideas and areas difficult and fragmentary. However, some exploration occurs within our primary mission, in which NASA establishes various research and study tasks pertaining to new programs and devices. Also, we are requested by NASA to be alert for and to document instances in which space-developed technology may be utilized in other fields.

(a) As the space program matures, please describe what efforts JPL has undertaken or plans to undertake to make use of its existing competence.

As you know, our primary mission is the unmanned exploration of the planets, and this venture has just begun. The maturation to which you refer is not imminent, either scientifically or technologically. The exploration of the planets would only be abandoned for lack of Congressional support and funding.

However, in view of existing national needs, our planning office is studying the feasibility of our performing work in new areas. In certain selected fields in which our competence has been demonstrated, we plan to make proposals on a modest scale through NASA for undertaking new work.

3. Please describe the results of JPL's discussions with the Los Angeles Police Department.